



---

Aspects of Medizing: Themistocles, Simonides, and Timocreon of Rhodes

Author(s): Rachel M. McMullin

Source: *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 97, No. 1 (Oct. - Nov., 2001), pp. 55-67

Published by: The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3298434>

Accessed: 03/03/2010 07:43

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=camws>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc.* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ASPECTS OF MEDIZING: THEMISTOCLES, SIMONIDES,  
AND TIMOCREON OF RHODES

So few fragments attested to the lyric poet Timocreon of Rhodes remain, that it is not surprising that he has failed to receive the attention he deserves. The largest extant fragment (PMG 727) has received the most attention, consisting mainly of attempts to date the poem and fit it into continuing discussions about the sequence and dating of events of the Persian wars. In this paper, I will argue that Timocreon's poetry can also provide valuable information on how the issue of medizing was viewed during the wars.<sup>1</sup> We can look at Timocreon in connection with his relationships with Themistocles and Simonides, who were both prominent figures during this period. An examination of the issue of medizing in the context of the ties between these three men allows us to bring together the poetic and historical traditions of the war, combining various aspects of medizing which have in the past been examined only separately. This can help illuminate what certainly must have been a complex situation, one evoking strong emotions among both those Greeks who had stood against the Persians and those who had submitted to their rule.

I will not discuss in detail the debate concerning the fact of medizing (i.e. whether or not any particular Greek actually collaborated with the Persians), but rather the emotional atmosphere in Greece after the wars. Specifically, two contradictory trends in Greek attitudes toward medizers are revealed during the time period from Marathon to the end of the third decade of the fifth century. First, there is a tendency toward forgiveness and a desire to rejoice in the Greek victory: most medizers escaped without any retaliation. Second, and in sharp contrast, in the midst of the celebration, fear and anger directed against medizers resulted in exile and punishment for some. Certain individuals were branded as medizers and suffered for this. At Athens, at least, these charges seem to have been politically motivated; an astute politician was able to use the label of medizer to inflame the *demos* and achieve the ostracism of his opponents. The significant feature of this situation is that both attitudes (elation and forgiveness versus fear and prosecution)

<sup>1</sup> For the origin and usage of the Greek *μηδίζειν*, see Graf 1984.

existed during the same period. Timocreon provides the prospective of an individual who was excluded from the former and felt the latter.

First, let us look at the fragments relevant to the argument. Timocreon's longest surviving poem (PMG 727), a bitter attack against Themistocles, is preserved by Plutarch.<sup>2</sup>

ἀλλ' εἰ τὺ γε Πausανίαν ἢ καὶ τὺ γε Ξάνθιππον αἰνεῖς.  
ἢ τὺ γε Λευτυχίδαν. ἐγὼ δ' Ἀριστείδαν ἐπαινέω  
ἄνδρ' ἱερᾶν ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν  
ἐλθεῖν ἕνα λῶιστον. ἐπεὶ Θεμιστοκλῆν ἤχθαρε Λατώ.

ψεύσαν ἄδικον προδόταν. ὅς Τιμοκρέοντα ξεῖνον ἔοντα  
ἀργυρίοις κοβαλισκοῖσι πεισθεὶς οὐ κατὰ γεν  
πατρίδ' Ἰαλυσὸν εἶς (ω).  
λαβὼν δὲ τριῖ ἀργυρίου τάλαντ' ἔβα πλέων εἰς ὄλεθρον.

τοὺς μὲν κατὰ γων ἀδίκως. τοὺς δ' ἐκδιώκων. τοὺς δὲ καίνων·  
ἀπγυρίων δ' ὑπόπλεως Ἰσθμοῖ γελοίως πανδόκευε  
ψυχρὰ (τὰ) κρεῖα παρίσχω·  
οἱ δ' ἥσθιον κηῦχοντο μὴ ὦραν Θεμιστοκλέος γενέσθαι.<sup>3</sup>

But if you praise Pausanias or even Xanthippus,  
or you praise Leotychides, I praise Aristides the  
one best man to come from holy Athens, since  
Leto conceived a hatred for Themistocles,

A liar, an unjust man, and a betrayer, who was  
persuaded by evil money and did not take back  
home Timocreon, even though he was his guest  
friend, to his fatherland Ialysus, but seizing three  
talents of silver he went away, sailing to hell,

restoring some unjustly, and pursuing others,  
and killing others; and stuffed full of silver, he  
laughingly offered entertainment at the  
Isthmus, serving cold meat; and they ate and  
prayed that no attention be paid to Themistocles.

There are two opposing views among scholars on the dating of this poem. Some date it to the period just after the major battles of the war and the formation of the Delian League (480-477); others wish to place it after the ostracism or condemnation of Themistocles in the

<sup>2</sup> *Them.* 21.

<sup>3</sup> Greek text as given by Page 1962, translations are my own.

late 470s.<sup>4</sup> The earlier date is more secure, as it more easily accommodates two references in the poem which have been the source of much debate. First, Leto's hatred for Themistocles seems to refer to the Delian League, which was formed in 478/7, especially as its organizer was Themistocles' enemy Aristides, who receives praise from Timocreon.<sup>5</sup> Themistocles' inn-keeping at the Isthmus would then be the meeting of Greeks at the Isthmus after Salamis in 480, where Themistocles hoped to win the prize for valor. Another argument for the earlier dating is the fall from grace of all four of the other men shortly after the wars, including Aristides, whom Timocreon has singled out for praise, who virtually disappears after the founding of the Delian league.<sup>6</sup>

Plutarch also provides us with a second fragment written after Themistocles was accused of medizing (PMG 729).

οὐκ ἄρα Τιμοκρέων μόνος  
Μήδοισιν ὀρκιατομεῖ·  
ἀλλ' ἐντὶ κάλλοι δὴ πονη-  
ροὶ κοῦκ ἐγὼ μόνον κόλου-  
ρις· ἐντὶ κάλλαι 'λώπεκες.<sup>7</sup>

So Timocreon was not the only one who swore oaths with the Medes, but there are other foul men; I am not the only bushy-tailed one, but there are also other foxes.

Timocreon has been declared a medizer by both Plutarch and modern scholars based on the evidence of these two fragments. But I

<sup>4</sup> For longer discussions on the dating of 727, see Bowra 1936: 373-6, Meiggs 1972: 414-5, Podlecki 1975: 51-3, Robertson 1980: 61-78, and Schieber 1982: 5-14.

<sup>5</sup> First suggested by Bowra 1936: 375-6. Scodel 1983 suggests that Leto is chosen to hate Themistocles because she is the most kind of the gods. Thus she would only hate the worst sort of man. Based on the political nature of the poem, however, it seems more reasonable that the reference is to a specific event with political ramifications rather than a general insult.

<sup>6</sup> Robertson 1980, who wishes to date the poem later, interprets the priamel as heavily ironic. He believes that Timocreon purposefully chose four other leaders who had been disgraced, and compared Themistocles against them as the worst of all. There are no other examples, however, of a priamel being used in this way in lyric poetry. This interpretation also forces the reader to twist the meaning of the text, which clearly says that others *praise* the other leaders. The poem makes more sense if we assume it to have been written shortly after Timocreon's trouble with Themistocles rather than in the late 470s.

<sup>7</sup> Aesop 41 is the story of the docked tailed fox, who lost his tail in a trap and then tried to convince other foxes to cut off their own tails in order to hide his own shame. Thus, with other men now being accused as medizers, Timocreon does not feel the burden of his shame so much.

would argue that this should not be taken for granted. There are several possible ways to interpret Timocreon's "medizer" poem. The first possibility is that Timocreon might not be a medizer and is merely assuming a persona for his poetry, such as Anacreon has done.<sup>8</sup> This, however, seems unlikely to me for three reasons. First, the two poems are closely tied together by the use of Timocreon's name, the same name which is attested as the actual name of a Rhodian poet by other sources. Second, a persona seems less likely in a poem which praises and criticizes real people, who are clearly not stock characters. Third, medizing was a serious charge and would be a dangerous stance to adopt, even through a persona.

The other two options are more difficult to separate. Timocreon may have either been an actual medizer or he may have been falsely accused of medizing. Although the second interpretation could be argued based on the lack of context for the five lines above, I tend to accept that Timocreon was a medizer. Beyond the evidence from ancient sources that Timocreon spent time at the court of the Persian king, we should consider the situation at Rhodes.<sup>9</sup> The island was certainly under Persian control during the second invasion period and had been for some time; nor does the island appear to have taken part in the Ionian revolt in 494. It appears that the Rhodians accepted, even if they did not enjoy, Persian rule.

So why would Timocreon, the poet and athlete, hesitate to seek fame and patronage at the king's court under these circumstances? Visiting Persia would appear to be an anti-Greek, medizing action only in retrospect, *after* the war was won by the Greeks. After the war, his presence in Persia made him an obvious scapegoat. Although there is no surviving proof that Timocreon colluded with the Persians (as with Hippias at Marathon) or actively betrayed his fellow Greeks (as with Ephialtes at Thermopylae), his contact with the Persians was enough to brand him a medizer.<sup>10</sup> There were a number of others who fell into the same troubles as Timocreon, but I will return to such evidence later. For now, let us examine Timocreon's poetry in the context of the poetic tradition on the Persian wars.

<sup>8</sup> This is suggested as a possibility by Robertson 1980: 64, but he refused to draw a conclusion about Timocreon's medism.

<sup>9</sup> Athenaeus quotes Thrasyarchus of Chalcedon on the subject of Timocreon's visit to Persia and his prowess as an athlete. Campbell 1992: 85-6.

<sup>10</sup> Thus, although I would answer 'yes' to the question of the reality of Timocreon's medism, I mean that he had certain connections to Persia, not that he provided actual aid or information during the invasion. Indeed, most of the "medizers" I mention in this paper fall into this category and not that of Ephialtes.

## I. Timocreon and Simonides

The evidence for a connection between Timocreon and Simonides is a little tenuous. We have the following pseudo-epitaph for Timocreon which is attributed to Simonides by Athenaeus (10.415 f.) and is also found in the *Palatine Anthology* (7.348):

πολλὰ πιὼν καὶ πολλὰ φαγὼν καὶ πολλὰ κάκ' εἰπὼν  
ἀνθρώπους κείμει Τιμοκρέων Ῥόδιος.

Having drunk a lot and having eaten a lot  
and having said a lot of bad things about  
men, Timocreon the Rhodian lies here.

This epitaph indicates that Simonides knew Timocreon and disliked him. The sentiment expressed seems too strong to indicate mere artistic differences. That the dislike was reciprocal may be hinted at by another of Timocreon's fragments, where he complains that he is forced to listen to Κηῖα φλυαρία (Cean nonsense), perhaps a reference to Simonides' birthplace (fr. 10 W). The connection between the two poets is strengthened somewhat by the ties which bind Simonides to Themistocles: Simonides is believed to have been living in Athens during the war and may have taken over Themistocles' (a patron perhaps) antipathy towards Timocreon.<sup>11</sup> The connection of Themistocles to Timocreon through Timocreon's poetry then convincingly ties the three into a group. Timocreon and Simonides may have been enemies because of the hostility between Timocreon and Themistocles.

The contrast between the poetry of Timocreon and Simonides is sharp in terms of both context and content. Simonides appears to have been *the* poet for the Greeks allied against Persia. There are numerous epitaphs ascribed to him. In addition to now-lost songs on the battles at Artemisium and Salamis, and work on the battle of Marathon, we possess a nine-line section of his dirge for the dead at Thermopylae and several large fragments from his Plataean elegy (PMG 531-6; frs. 10-18 W<sup>2</sup>).

These poems were written for public consumption. The epitaphs, of course, were available to any who visited the battle sites.

<sup>11</sup> Bowra 1961: 342, 358-9. For more on Themistocles as Simonides' patron see Molyneux 1992: 153-5. There is, of course, the possibility that Simonides' dislike of Timocreon rubbed off on Themistocles, but the result is the same.

His account of the sea battle of Salamis may have been performed at the founding of a shrine of Boreas near Athens or at the Panathenaea which celebrated the Greek victory.<sup>12</sup> The dirge for the dead at Thermopylae was probably performed publicly at a *σηκός* (sacred precinct) either at Thermopylae or in Sparta.<sup>13</sup> Simonides' work on Plataea was likely performed at a festival at Plataea, either contracted by a city or cities or as part of a choral competition.<sup>14</sup>

To state it simply, Simonides wrote poetry for the Greeks as victors. He wrote what they wanted to hear: how the Greeks came together and defeated the might of the boundless Persian empire. There is no place for dissent or medizing in Simonides' poetry. He ignores any problems that face panhellenic unity and instead rejoices in victory, praising the bravery of the living and the sacrifice of the dead.

This poetic tradition provides the context for examining Timocreon. In contrast to the public forum for Simonides' poetry, it is difficult to reconstruct the context in which Timocreon's poetry was performed. His invective against Themistocles appears to be choral in its meter, and the use of the encomium form for Aristides also points to choral poetry. Neither poem, however, is choral in content, since invective is part of the monodic tradition of Anacreon and Alcaeus and points to performance in the symposium.<sup>15</sup> I would speculate that Timocreon chose choral meters for his invective against Themistocles in mocking imitation of the type of songs which were being composed and performed in commemoration of the Greek victories, songs such as Simonides wrote. This would not only be consistent with his rivalry with Simonides but would also allow Timocreon to denigrate Themistocles by means of a style usually reserved for praise. In any event, the context of poetic performance was radically different for Timocreon than for Simonides.

The audience would also have differed greatly. Although Timocreon's audience for poems such as 727 and 729 must have been much smaller than Simonides' (at least in the period of euphoria over the Greek victory), his invective could have worked on two levels. His immediate audience consisted of his own friends, who would automatically be sympathetic to his plight. In addition, this poem would also have had a broader level of appeal. The priamel lists four men who were well-known to almost any Greek at that

<sup>12</sup> Bowra 1961: 343-4.

<sup>13</sup> Molyneux 1992: 185-7.

<sup>14</sup> Boedeker 1995: 220-5, Aloni 1997: 8-28.

<sup>15</sup> Scodel 1983: 102-4, Bowra 1936: 371-2.

time, and the body of the poem focuses less on Timocreon's personal quarrel with Themistocles than on what would have been a larger issue: how other Greeks were being treated at war's end by those relatively few cities that had not given in to the Persians. In addition, Timocreon emphasizes in his verses the issue of the breaking of a bond of ξενία, a theme which can be traced back to Homer, and which certainly would have raised indignation even among those who did not know the individuals involved.

Certainly, what Timocreon had to say could not have been said by Simonides. Timocreon openly admits that there were medizers and dissent, and throws these negative aspects of the war in the face of those who might have liked to pretend otherwise. Timocreon's poetry is the only poetry to survive which deals with these uncomfortable issues. However, if we analyze the same poems of Timocreon in connection with the historical tradition instead of the poetic, a very different picture of medizing during the war emerges.

The starting point for such a discussion is, of course, Herodotus. His account makes it clear that most of Greece crumbled before the Persians. In addition to Macedonia and Thessaly, all Chalcidice fell, all Boeotia except Thespieae and Plataea became Median allies, and all islands except Euboea, Seriphos, Siphos, and Melos had surrendered to Persia by the time of the battle of Salamis.<sup>16</sup> Many others hesitated to commit troops fully, as seen by the very small force at Thermopylae (the excuse of the Olympic games is a weak one when all of Greece is at risk).<sup>17</sup> In addition, Herodotus names individual Greeks, such as Ephialtes the traitor at Thermopylae, who hoped to offer information in exchange for Xerxes' favor. Yet after the war, Herodotus reports very little in the way of punishment for medizing cities.<sup>18</sup> Based on Herodotus' account, Daniel Gillis concludes:

There was no massive revenge on medizing states when the danger had passed. Even the gruff Spartan suggestion that the Ionians be given lands confiscated from Medists was not adopted. The allies seemed content, for a while, to allow things to return to normal in Hellas, and then to think about operations in the East. Former Medizers were no threat, because the power they had embraced and relied upon no longer counted. Not even local

<sup>16</sup>Her. 7.118-132, 8. 46. See Gillis 1979: 60-64 for a complete summary of medizing cities.

<sup>17</sup>Her. 7.201-6.

<sup>18</sup>He does claim that Themistocles sailed around the islands to demand money, that Andros was besieged, and that Carystos and Paros paid large fines. Herodotus, however, claims that this action was taken only on Themistocles' part and on account of greed (8.112).



scores were settled under the guise of punishment for collaboration. For farsighted reasons, Themistocles again led the way. Greece had suffered enough.<sup>19</sup>

As far as medizing *cities* are concerned, Gillis' conclusion seems sound. The fact, however, that many cities were forced to join (or at least forced to remain a part of) the Delian League and provide money or ships to the cause could be construed as a sort of punishment. Also, Gillis' account stops (along with Herodotus') at Plataea and so does not examine accusations of medizing that occurred after the initial period of the wars. Many of those accusations focused not on cities, but on individuals such as Timocreon, and later, Themistocles, to whom I now turn.

## II. Timocreon, Themistocles, and Ostracism in Athens

As I have shown, Themistocles is linked by evidence of poetry to both Timocreon and Simonides. He can add a great deal to the discussion of medizing because, as an important historical figure, his biography has been recorded in much greater detail than those of the poets. Therefore, while we have little background to answer our questions on Timocreon (who was he, what part did he play in the war, why was he charged with medizing?), we can discuss Themistocles with more confidence. It is, certainly, a great irony that Themistocles was himself ostracized and then condemned on charges of medizing, and it must have been sweet vindication for Timocreon. There is even greater irony in the fact that his condemnation finally drove Themistocles from Greece and into the court of Artaxerxes.<sup>20</sup> The charge of medism seems to have led to his actual medism.

In addition to Themistocles, all the other leaders listed by Timocreon soon fell or at least faded from power. Pausanias was removed from his command under charges of insufferable behavior and medism.<sup>21</sup> In fact, of the five leaders mentioned by Timocreon (PMG 727.1-2), only Leotychides was *not* tainted by a charge of medizing at some point in his career. Xanthippus and Aristides had both been ostracized in the mid 480s (a fact which may have made them sympathetic figures to Timocreon) and were only recalled when Athens was struggling to reach full strength for the

<sup>19</sup> Gillis 1979: 81.

<sup>20</sup> Thuc. 1. 135-38.

<sup>21</sup> Thuc. 1. 129-134.

war effort. Their ostracisms, though occurring before Timocreon's poem was written, add yet another aspect to the discussion of medizing. Fear of medizers was a factor in ostracism at Athens both in the period after Marathon and in the period following the second Persian war.

In the 480s, when it was first employed, ostracism was connected to a fear of the Persians. A number of existing ostraka indicate this clearly. There are, for instance, some eleven ostraka against a certain Callias son of Cratia (perhaps ostracized in 486/5) which refer to him as ὁ μῆδος, the mede.<sup>22</sup> Another even includes a caricature of Callias dressed in Persian costume.<sup>23</sup> The Aristides of Timocreon's poem is also described on an ostrakon as a medizer. He is called 'the brother of Datis,' who was the Persian commander who led the campaign against Marathon in 490.<sup>24</sup>

Based on this evidence, Johan Schreiner has suggested that ostracism was put into law not to oppose tyranny (as the *Athenaion Politeia* suggests, XXII.3-8), but rather specifically to expel medizers.<sup>25</sup> This theory has not been generally accepted, but rather scholars have melded together the evidence of the ostraka and the *Athenaion Politeia* to include both possibilities.<sup>26</sup> Tyranny was closely connected with the Persians in the minds of the Greeks in general and the Athenians in particular. Not only did the Persians maintain control of Ionia by the imposition of tyrants, but Athens' own former tyrant, Hippias, had fled to Persia when disposed, and had sailed back with the fleet of Datis, hoping to be reinstated.<sup>27</sup> Thus a medizer and a potential tyrant were one and the same to the Athenians. This is supported by the fact that the *Athenaion Politeia* reports that the first three Athenians ostracized were family or friends of the Peisistratids. This list includes Hipparchus, a Peisistratid, and Megacles, of the Alcmaeonid family, which fell

<sup>22</sup> Schreiner 1970: 88.

<sup>23</sup> Vanderpool 1970: 21, Lang 1990: 38, no. 56 and fig. 3.

<sup>24</sup> This interpretation of the surviving text was first proposed by Raubitschek 1957: 234-9. The text of this ostrakon is problematic, but Aristides' prominent position in Timocreon's poem leads me to speculate about a possible connection between his ostracism and a charge of medizing.

<sup>25</sup> This was proposed by Schreiner 1970: 84-97.

<sup>26</sup> Podlecki 1975: 185-94, Thomsen 1972: 118-32. For more on the dating of the law of ostracism and its intent, see in addition Hignett 1952: 159-66, and Kagan 1961: 393-401.

<sup>27</sup> Thucydides provides some additional support for the connection between medism and tyranny. In a speech where the Thebans defend themselves against a charge of medism, a major point of their defense is that at the time of their collaboration their government was "nearest a tyranny" ἐγγυτάτω δὲ τυράννου. Thuc. 3. 62. Thus the majority of the population were unwilling medizers.

under suspicion of treason at Marathon. The fourth man ostracized was the Xanthippus mentioned by Timocreon (*PMG* 727.1).<sup>28</sup> He may have been considered a threat as a medizer on account of his marriage to a daughter of the Alcmaeonid family.

Beyond the connection between tyrants and the Persians there may have been a specific political reason for accusations against these men. They all supported a policy of appeasement and reconciliation with the Persians after the Ionian revolt in 494.<sup>29</sup> A reasonable policy, until the victory at Marathon made it look like collaboration with the enemy. The political enemies of these men, lead by Themistocles, were then able to use their miscalculation against them, rousing public fervor and bringing about their ostracism. Karavites specifically argues this in the case of Hipparchus and Megacles, even though we have no 'medizing' ostraka for them.<sup>30</sup>

To this list we can then add Xanthippus and perhaps Callias "the Mede," even though we do not know if he was actually ostracized. Aristides may also belong on this list based not only on the ostrakon mentioned above, but on Herodotus' report that he was ostracized in the 480s before being recalled, and the fact that he, too, was a political opponent of Themistocles.<sup>31</sup> These issues combined make it possible that a charge of medism was a factor in his ostracism. I am not arguing, of course, that this was the only or even the overriding factor in the ostracism of any of the men exiled in this period. That would vastly oversimplify the political situation at Athens.<sup>32</sup> Medism was, nonetheless, at the center of the rhetoric that convinced a sufficient number of the *demos* that certain politicians should be ostracized.

If Aristides can be included in that list of men ostracized under a shadow of medism, this fully explains Timocreon's encomium of him. First, Aristides is ostracized by the despicable Themistocles,

<sup>28</sup> Her. 6. 121-4.

<sup>29</sup> Thomsen 1972: 131-3 and Karavites 1977: 135-8 come to very similar conclusions about the effect of Marathon on Athenian policy towards Persia. In their individual frameworks a "pro-Persian" faction is one that wanted to appease Persia to convince them to allow Athens to remain at least nominally free, *not* a faction which hoped to restore Hippias as tyrant or desired Persian interference in Athenian affairs.

<sup>30</sup> Thomsen argues that Hipparchus was elected Archon for 494/3 for the purpose of showing the Persians that the Athenians still supported Hippias' family, if not Hippias himself.

<sup>31</sup> Her. 8. 79. Thomsen adds Aristides to his list of those ostracized under the pretext of medism. The suggested date is 484/3.

<sup>32</sup> See Karavites 1977 for a discussion of the actual motives behind the ostracism of these men.

who uses the term 'medizer' as a firebrand. A few years later, Aristides is allowed to return to Athens in the face of the second invasion and proves himself a loyal Greek in the war—a chance denied to Timocreon by Themistocles.<sup>33</sup>

Even if the evidence for Aristides as an individual is too weak to make the prior argument convincing, the evidence of the connection between medism and ostracism adds to the picture of the Athenian attitudes toward medizing. Not only does it convincingly show a significant fear of medism at Athens, but the circumstances at Athens in the 480s provide a context for the problems of Pausanias and Timocreon, for whom we have much less evidence. Just as the appeasement policy of some Athenian politicians looked like a crime after Marathon, Timocreon's visit to Persia, reasonable while Rhodes was controlled by Persia, seemed like betrayal and collaboration after the second war. Similarly, Pausanias' arrogant ways and his adoption of Persian customs may have been turned into a very effective weapon by his political enemies.

Pausanias' fall and the ostracism of Themistocles show that the fear of medizing continued for some time after the wars. Themistocles was not ostracized until the last years of the 470s, yet both Thucydides and Plutarch tell us that after his ostracism he was condemned at Athens on charges of medizing.<sup>34</sup> That the Persian war was still very much on the minds of the Athenians is shown by Aeschylus' production of the *Persae* in 472 (with Pericles as choregos). The play may have even been written for Themistocles, to remind the Athenians of his role in the wars and to bolster his failing popularity.<sup>35</sup> The play won first prize, but Themistocles was nonetheless ostracized.<sup>36</sup> Significantly, we know that the at Themistocles' trial for medism, the prosecutor was Leobotes, a member of the Alcmaeonid family. Apparently his enemies finally achieved their revenge by using his own tool against him.<sup>37</sup>

Whether or not any of these men were actual medizers is not critical to my argument. What is important is that an acute fear of the Persians and of medizers existed at Athens. Numerous Athenian leaders were ostracized based partially on this fear. Even as the

<sup>33</sup> The same story also applies to Xanthippos, the other Athenian named by Timocreon.

<sup>34</sup> Thuc. 1. 135-37.3, Plut. *Them.* 23. 3-4.

<sup>35</sup> Podlecki 1975: 37.

<sup>36</sup> See Hall 1989, ch. 2 for the comparison of the Greeks and Persians in the *Persae*, and the use of barbarians to define what is Greek.

<sup>37</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 25. 3. Karavites believes that this fact strengthens the argument that Themistocles was behind the ostracisms of the 480s. 1977: 144.

Greeks celebrated their victories at Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea, and attempted panhellenic unity, the fear remained paramount in the minds of a significant number of Athenians. The accusation that Hipparchus, Themistocles, Pausanias, Aristides, or even Timocreon was a medizer might be a lie, but it was a lie that worked. All of those men suffered under the label of medizer.<sup>38</sup>

Timocreon, Simonides, and Themistocles are all pieces of the puzzle that one can put together to recreate a clearer picture of how the Greeks dealt with the specter of medizing during and after the wars. A comparison of the poetry of Simonides and Timocreon shows a sharp contrast. Simonides is the model for the celebration of Greek victory and Greek unity. Timocreon is an individual voice of suffering, dissent, and anger. When we tie in the historical tradition, the picture becomes even more complex. There are the countless medizing cities reported by Herodotus and their apparent escape from punishment; the fall of Pausanias as told by Thucydides; the obvious fear of tyrants and medizers that continued to exist in Athens years after victory; and finally, the fall of Themistocles, which leads us back to Timocreon. He is the lynch pin that holds the story together, the only voice which expresses the view of the medizer.

When all these pieces are put into place, they reveal a complex picture of what was happening in the minds of the Greeks during the Persian wars. On the surface were relief and joy in the victory. Beneath there was fear: fear of medizers and fear in the minds of Greeks who had chosen the wrong side. Medizing cities escaped punishment for the most part, as they were too numerous to punish and the desire for revenge against Persia was much greater. It was the individuals who suffered, and the merest rumor seems to have been reason enough for punishment. We will never know if the rumors about Timocreon's treason were true, but I hope to have shown how much he was implicated in a widespread and often pernicious Greek fear of medism.

RACHEL M. McMULLIN

*University of Wisconsin, Madison*

<sup>38</sup> The political situation at Athens is superficially comparable to the McCarthy years of the early cold war between the US and Russia. In each cases, fear of the other (communists and Persians) led to the chasing of rumors and the prosecution and persecution of those suspected of betrayal. It did not require much evidence to be condemned as a communist or a medizer.

## Bibliography

- Aloni, A. 1997. "The Proem of the Simonides Elegy on the Battle of Plataea and the Circumstances of Its Performance," in *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*. L. Edmunds and R.W. Wallace, eds. Baltimore.
- Bowra, C.M. 1963. *Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford.
- Boedeker, D. 1995. "Simonides on Plataea: Narrative Elegy, Mythodic History." *ZPE*: 217-29.
- Campbell, D.A. 1992. *Greek Lyric IV*. Cambridge, MA.
- Gillis, D. 1979. "Collaboration with the Persians." *Historia* 34. 39-87.
- Graf, D.F. 1984. "Medism: the Origin and Significance of the Term." *JHS* 104: 15-30.
- Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian*. Oxford.
- Hignett, C. 1952. *A History of the Athenian Constitution*. Oxford.
- Kagan, D. 1961. "The Origin and Purposes of Ostracism." *Hesperia* 30: 393-401.
- Karavites, P. 1977. "Realities and Appearances, 490-480 B.C." *Historia* 26: 129-47.
- Lang, M.L. 1990. *The Athenian Agora 25: Ostraka*. Princeton.
- Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford.
- Molyneux, J.H. 1992. *Simonides: A Historical Study*. Wauconda, IL.
- Page, D.L. 1962. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford.
- Podlecki, A.J. 1975. *The Life of Themistocles*. Montreal.
- Raubitschek, A.E. 1957. "Das Datislied." *Charites.*, Bonn. 234-242.
- Robertson, N. 1980. "Timocreon and Themistocles." *AJPh* 101: 61-78.
- Schieber, A.S. 1982. "Leotychidas in Thessaly." *AC* 51: 5-14.
- Schreiner, J.H. 1970. "The Origin of Ostracism Again." *C&M* 31: 84-97.
- Scodel, R. 1983. "Timocreon's Encomium of Aristides." *Cl Ant* 2: 102-7.
- Thomsen, R. 1972. *The Origin of Ostracism*. Copenhagen.
- Vanderpool, E. 1970. "Ostracism at Athens." *Lectures in Memory of L.T. Semple*. (second series) Cincinnati.
- West, M.L. 1971. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*. Oxford.